Remarks/Arguments

Claims 41, 43 and 47-50 have been amended. Claims 42 and 44-46 have been canceled.

Claims 41-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unatentable over the Pfeiffer et al. patent. With respect to applicant's claims, as amended, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claims 41 and 47 have been amended to bette define

applicant's invention. Applicant's amended claim 41 now recites that the image capture unit

permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a lithat the image compression unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory ever time a predetermined time is passed. Similarly, amended claim 47 now requires that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory in a blanking period, a that the image capture unit permits the refresh control unit to refre

Such constructions are not believed to be taught or suggested by the reiffer et al. patent in particular, the Pfeiffer, et al. patent discusses at column 23, lines 35-47, the refreshing of the memory DRAMS and states that "the video DRAM refresh controller 232 is rogrammed to request DRAM refresh memory cycles on a periodic basis, as programmed a register in the bus interface 240." The patent also states at lines 21-27 of communication munication in munication munication in munication munic

Thus, in the Pfeiffer, et al. patent the programmed refresh controller controls refreshing of the memory 82 DRAMS and an arbiter arbitrates access to the memory. However, is not believed that the patent teaches or suggests an image capture unit which permodes a refresh control unit to refresh a memory in a blanking period and an image compression unitary which permits the refresh control unit to refresh the memory every time a predetermined time is assed, or an image capture unit which permits a refresh control unit to refresh a memory in a blanking period and an image processing unit which permits the refresh control unit to refresh he memory every time a predetermined time is passed. Applicant's amended claims 41 and 47, and their respective dependent claims, all of which recite one or the other of such features thus passed in trols refreshing through the memory. However, is not so a refresh control unit to refresh control unit to refresh control unit to refresh a memory in a blanking period and an image processing unit which permits the refresh control unit to refresh he memory every time a predetermined time is passed. Applicant's amended claims 41 and 47, and their respective dependent claims, all of which recite one or the other of such features thus passed.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicant's claims, as amend i patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. accordingly, reconsideration of the c ims is respectfully requested.

Dated: September 4, 2003

ROBIN, BLECKER & DALEY 330 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10017 T (212) 682-9640 Respectfully submitted,

John J. Top ente Reg. No. 26,359 Attorney of Record

OFFICIAL